

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03162 01 OF 02 061437Z

44

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EURE-00 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 ACDA-19 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 DRC-01 OMB-01 /122 W

----- 050019

P R 061300Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 6137

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4070

AMEMBASSY MADRID

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

USCINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3162

E.O. 11652: GDS 12-31-80

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJECT: BILATERALS WITH NATO DEFENSE MINISTERS

1. DURING MY RECENT VISIT TO WASHINGTON, I SUGGESTED TO SECDEF THAT IT COULD BE HELPFUL TO US INTERESTS IF HE CONDUCTED A SERIES OF BILATERAL MEETINGS WITH DEVENSE MINISTERS FROM NATO COUNTRIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUNE MINISTERIAL MEETINGS.

2. FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE, THE FOLLOWING DEFENSE ORIENTED TOPICS APPEAR TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR BILATERAL DISCUSSION: (NOTE: THIS MESSAGE DOES NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF JUST COMPLETED BILATERALS WITH FRG MODS).

A. IMPLEMENTATION OF NATO FORCE GOALS. (APPLICABLE TO ALL DPC MEMBERS EXCEPT ICELAND.) NATO HAS JUST ESTABLISHED FORCE GOALS AS PLANNING TARGETS FOR NATO FORCES FOR THE PERIOD 1975-1980. THE MISITARY COMMITTEE(MC) HAS INDICATED THAT IM-CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 03162 01 OF 02 061437Z

PLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDE FORCE GOALS WOULD ENHANCE NATOS CAPABILITY TO MAINTAIN A VIABLE CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE POSTURE. THE MAJORITY OF THE RECOMMENDED FORCE IMPROVEMENTS ARE ROOTED IN AD-70 AND BASIC ISSURES STUDIES, I.E., MANY TOUCH ON

AREAS THAT THE US HAS PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS ESSENTIAL FOR BUILDING AND MAINTAINING A FULLY ADEQUATE NATO CONVENTIONAL POSTURE. SECDEF COULD ENCOURAGE MINISTERS TO IMPLEMENT THE FORCE GOALS ESTABLISHED FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES, ESPECIALLY GOALS OFFERING OPPORTUNITIES FOR STANDARDIZATION AND LOW COST/NO COST IMPROVEMENTS, AND REMIND MINISTERS THAT AT TIME OF DPC REVIEW, US IDENTIFIED NOTIONAL FORCE PROPOSALS/FORCE GOALS CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL.

B. STANDARDIZATION AND REPLACEMENT OF F-104. (STANDARDIZATION APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTRIES; REPLACEMENT OF F-104 TO BELGIUM, DENMARK, NETHERLAND, AND NORWAY.) THE LACK OF WEAPONS STANDARDIZATION SERIOUSLY IMPACTS ON INTEROPERABILITY OF NATO FORCES, AND PROLIFERATION OF SIMILAR WEAPON SYSTEMS RESULTS IN UNNECESSARY WASTED OF LIMITED RESOURCES. ONE OF MOST OBVIOUS OPPORTUNITIES FOR STANDARDIZATION IS THE NEED TO REPLACE F-104 WITH A MORE MODERN AIRPLANE. SECDEF SHOULD STRESS THAT OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION IN CHOOSING A REPLACEMENT FOR F-104 MUST BE THE MILITARY AND TECHNICAL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WEAPON SYSTEM AND THAT THE AMERICAN CONTENDERS ARE CONSIDERED BY EXPERTS TO BE SUPERIOR TECHNOLOGICALLY TO THEIR COMPETITORS. FURTHERMORE, A US AIRCRAFT WOULD HAVE THE ADVANTAGE OF GUARANTEED LOGISTICAL SUPPORT THROUGH THE LIFE OF THE WEAPON SYSTEM AND IF A US PLANE IS CHOSEN, IT WOULD ACTUALLY BE A EUROPEAN PLANE AS IT WOULD BE PRODUCED IN EUROPE BY A CONSORTIUM OF EUROPEAN COMPANIES. IT WOULD BE PARTICULARLY HELPFUL IF SECDEF COULD EXPAND ON US WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN AND TO SUPPORT AIRCRAFT ACQUISITION PROGRAMS. OTHER PROMINENT AREAS FOR STANDARDIZATION ARE: AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS, TANK GUN/TANK, ELECTRONIC WARFARE, AND RIFLE/RIFLE AMMUNITION. NATO FORCE GOALS FOR INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES IDENTIFY A GREAT MANY ADDITIONAL AREAS OFFERING STANDARDIZATION POTENTIAL. IF SECDEF CAN DISCUSS US PLAN TO PROCURE SHORTLY MANUFACTURED IN EUROPE, THIS WOULD HELP DEMONSTRATE THAT US DOES NOT REGARD STANDARDIZATION AS A ONE-WAY STREET.

C. DEFENSE SPENDING AND US TROOP COMMITMENT TO EUROPE. (APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTRIES; PARTICULARLY APPLICABLE TO THE NETHERLANDS.) US HAS CONTINUALLY STATED THAT, GIVEN A SIMILAR CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 03162 01 OF 02 061437Z

APPROACH BY OUR ALLIES, WE WOULD MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE OUR OWN FORCES IN EUROPE. IT SHOULD BE POINTED OUT THAT THE EFFORTS OF SOME OF OUR ALLIES APPEAR TO BE SLACKENING, WHICH RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT WHETHER SOME ALLIES ARE IN FACT TAKING A "SIMILAR APPROACH" TO NATO DEFENSE. FOR EXAMPLE, THE NETHERLANDS HAS BEGUN CONSULTATION WITH NATO ON THEIR NEW DEFENSE PLAN; IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE IF SECDEF WEIGHED IN WITH NETHERLAND DEFENSE MINISTER, PARTICULARLY ON THE PLANNED REDUCTION IN GROUND FORCE CAPABILITY WHICH WILL APPARENTLY MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE 1ST NETHERLANDS CORPS TO CARRY OUT ITS ASSIGNED MISSION. SECDEF SHOULD EMPHASIZE TO ALL DEFENSE MINISTERS THAT DEFENSE SPENDING, MEASURED IN REAL PURCHASING POWER, MUST AS A MINIMUM BE MAINTAINED AND SHOULD BE INCREASED AT RATE (APPROX-

IMATELY 3 TO 4 PER CENT IN REAL TERMS) ACCOMPLISHED BY MOST MEMBERS IN 1971, 1972, AND 1973.

D. BURDENSARING. (APPLICABLE TO ALL.) SECDEF MIGHT WISH TO REMIND HIS COLLEAGUES DURING BILATERALS THAT, WHEREAS WE SEEM TO BE MAKING RELATIVELY GOOD PROGRESS IN MEETING THE PROVISIONS OF THE JACKSON-NUNN AMENDMENT, BURDNESHARING IS STILL A LONG TERM PROPOSITION. THERE MUST BE AN EQUITABLE SHARING OF THE DEFENSE BURDEN IN BUDGETARY AS WELL AS BALANCE OF PAYMENT TERMS.

E. INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM CEILING AND COST SHARING, 1975-1979. EXAMINATION OF NATOS INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM INDICATES THAT THE RESOURCES BEING APPLIED TO THIS ESSENTIAL ASPECT OF DEFENSE SHOW SIGNS OF FALLING SIGNIFICANTLY BEHIND THE ESSENTIAL MINIMUM TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUPPORTING FACILITIES FOR THE MODERN WEAPON SYSTEMS BEING INTRODUCED INTO NATO FORCES. DESPITE EXTENSIVE STUDY AND DISCUSSION, NATO HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO AGREE TO A TOTAL LEVEL OF INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING OR A COST-SHARING ARRANGEMENT ACCEPTABLE TO ALL NATIONS. THE UK HAS BEEN ADAMANT AGAINST ACCEPTING A CEILING HIGHER THAN IAU 300 MILLION. THE EUROPEAN DISCUSSION GROUP EXAMINING THIS SUBJECT JUST PROPOSED A CEILING OF IAU 450 MILLION, WITHIN WHICH SOME IAU 30 MILLION WOULD BE DEVOTED TO PURELY US PROJECTS. THE PROPOSAL IS ACCEPTABLE TO THE US PROVIDED IT IS MODIFIED (1) TO INCLUDE FINANCIAL REVIEW AND REEVALUATION OF PROGRAM SIZE DURING THE FOURTH YEAR (1978), (2) THE SPECIAL PROGRAM IS INCREASED TO IAU 41 MILLION, AND (3) SPECIAL PROGRAM IS LIMITED TO PROJECTS CURRENTLY INELIGIBLE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE, E.G., IN SUPPORT OF US STATIONED FORCES(SEE STATE 116970).
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 03162 01 OF 02 061437Z

IF COMPROMISE PROPOSAL ENCOUNTERS DIFFICULTIES, SECDEF MAY WISH TO INTERVENE WITH UK DEFENSE MINISTER AND OTHERS, IN AN ATTEMPT TO ELICIT A MORE FORTHCOMING ATTITUDE WHICH WOULD PERMIT NATO AN ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM IN SUPPORT OF FORCE PLANS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 03162 02 OF 02 061450Z

44

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EURE-00 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 ACDA-19 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 DRC-01 OMB-01 /122 W

----- 050283

P R 061300Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 6138

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4071
AMEMBASSY MADRID
USDEL MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
USCINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3162

F. NATO REINFORCEMENT PLANNING. PREPARATION FOR THE TIMELY INTRODUCTION OF EXTERNAL REINFORCEMENTS AND THE PROVISION OF RECEPTION ARRANGEMENTS FOR REINFORCING FORCES, INCLUDING SHELTERS FOR US RAPID REACTION AIRCRAFT, HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN ONGOING AD-70 WORK AS AMONG CRITICAL AREAS MERITING SPECIAL ATTENTION. SECDEF MAY WISH TO REITERATE TO THE BELGIAN, DUTCH, GERMAN, AND NORWEGIAN MODS THE URGENT NEED TO PROVIDE RECEPTION FACILITIES FOR REINFORCING US TACTICAL AIRCRAFT AND AIRLIFT FORCES AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT NATO DURING A CRISIS OR AN EMERGENCY; HE MAY ALSO WISH TO REITERATE NEED FOR A WARTIME LOC AGREEMENT AND USE OF ALLIES SHIPPING.

G. RATIONALIZATION/SPECIALIZATION(R/S). IN ORDER TO ENGENDER MORE ENTHUSIASM FOR R/S, SECDEF MAY WISH TO INFORM FRG AND UK MODS THAT US WILL TABLE AT NATO IN THE NEAR FUTURE ADDITIONAL IDEAS FOR A MATRIX AND EMPHASIZE THAT WE HOPE THE US PROPOSALS WOULD FORM A BASIS FOR DISCUSSION TO BUILD A NATO MATRIX. SECDEF MAY ALSO WISH TO EXPLORE WITH DUTCH MODS THE US AND NETHERLANDS MIGHT COOPERATE IN FURTHERING R/S, RECOGNIZING CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 03162 02 OF 02 061450Z

THAT DUTCH ARE STRONG SUPPORTERS.

H. NATO COOPERATION WITH SPAIN. AT DECEMBER DPC MINISTERIAL, SECDEF EMPHASIZED, IN CONTEXT OF AGGREGATE OF CONVENTIONAL FORCES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE FOR FULFILLMENT OF ALLIANCE SECURITY OBJECTIVES, THE VALUE OF SPAIN'S CONTRIBUTION. HE ADDED THE ALLIANCE SHOULD NOT TAKE THIS CONTRIBUTION FOR GRANTED, BUT SHOULD DEVELOP A PROGRAM OF MEASURES TO ENCOURAGE EVENTUAL LINKAGE OF SPANISH DEFENSE RESOURCES WITH THOSE OF NATO IN CONTEXT OF EUROPE'S OVERALL COMMITMENT TO WESTERN DEFENSE. SECDEF MAY WISH TO DISCUSS, PARTICULARLY WITH MODS FROM DENMARK, THE NETHERLAND, NORWAY, ITALY, AND UK, THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLOSER MILITARY COOPERATION BETWEEN NATO AND SPAIN (SEE USNATO 3067 AND ROME 7612).

I. NATO CONVENTIONAL BALANCE AND MC 161/74. A REALISTIC ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENTIONAL BALANCE IS PREREQUISITE FOR CONTINUED ALLIED EFFORTS TOWARD MAINTAINING AND IMPROVING THEIR CONVENTIONAL FORCES. IN THIS REGARD, WE UNDERSTAND FRG AND UK ANALYSES OF THE CONVENTIONAL BALANCE INDICATE THAT THEIR PERSPECTIVES ON WP MOBILIZATION TIMES, WARNING TIMES TO NATO, AND CONVENTIONAL FORCES AVAILABLE TO NATO'S DEFENSE DIFFER FROM THOSE OF THE US. SECDEF MAY WISH TO DISCUSS THESE DISCREP-

ANCIES WITH FRG AND UK MODS AND CONTINUE WITH GROUND WORK
NEEDED TO HAVE MC 161 BETTER REFLECT PACT WEAKNESSES AS WELL AS
STRENGTHS.

J. MODIFICATIONS TO US STRATEGIC TARGETING POLICY.
(APPLICABLE TO NDAC COUNTRIES.) WE WANT TO ACHIEVE FULL
UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT FOR THE MODIFICATIONS TO US
STRATEGIC TARGETING POLICY. ALLIED REACTIONS TO DATE HAVE
BEEN POSITIVE, AND DISCUSSION OF THEIS SUBJECT AT THE NPG AND
DPC MINISTERIAL MEETINGS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE SUBSTANTIALLY TO
ACHIEVING THIS OBJECTIVE. IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO REINFORCE THIS
CONSULTATIVE PROVESS IN BILATERAL DISCUSSIONS BY STRSSING THE
CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE NEW POLICIES TO THE CONTINUING CREDIBILITY
OF THE STRATEGIC UMBRELLA AND BY RESPONDING TO ANY QUESTIONS
THAT ALLIED MINISTERS MAY HAVE ON THIS SUBJECT.

K. IMPORVEMENTS TO NATOS TACTICAL NUCLEAR POSTURE.
(APPLICABLE TO NDAC COUNTRIES.) ALLIED INTEREST IN
POSSIBLE IMPROVMENTS TO NATOS TACTICAL NUCLEAR CAPABIOITIES
WILL BE HIGH BECAUSE OF SECRETARY SCHLESINGERS BREIFING ON US
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AT THE BERGEN NPG MEETING AND THE NPG
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 03162 02 OF 02 061450Z

STUDY OF IMPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS.

L. LIVE ELECTRONIC COUNTER-COUNTER MEASURES (ECCM)
TRAINI G FOR ACE AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM. MC AGREED TO NEED FOR LIVE
ELECTRONIC WARFARE TRAINING FOR ALLIED COMMAND EUROPE (ACE)
AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM, AND REQUESTED SHAPE TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS
ACCORDINGLY. SHAPE REQUESTED MILITARY BUDGET COMMITTEE TO
APPROVE COMMON FUNDING FOR THIS PURPOSE; ALL NATIONS HAVE AGREED
EXCEPT UK AND CANADA, WHO OPPOSE COMMON FUNDING ON BASIS THAT
IT MIGHT SET A PRECEDENT FOR NATIONS TO CLAIM NATO FUNDING FOR
OTHER NATO TRAINING EXERCISED. EFFORTS HERE AND IN WASHINGTON
TO INFLUENCE UK AND CANADA TO CHANGE THEIR POSITIONS HAVE BEEN
UNSUCCESSFUL. INBILATERALS, WE SUGGEST SECDEF SEEK REVERSAL
OF UK AND CANADIAN POSITIONS.

M. AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM(AWACS).
(APPLICABLE TO ALL.) PROGRESS THOWRD A NATO DECISION TO
PROCURE AWACS AS A COMMON NATO AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING SYSTEM IS
IS SLOW. SOURCES AND METHODS OF DUNDING ARE NOT RECEIVING
ADEQUATE ATTENTION. THE NETHERLAND, BELGIUM , DENMARK, AND
NORWAY ARE RESISTING SELECTION OF AWACS OR ANY OTHER SYSTEM
UNTIL SACEUR DEFINES DETAILED REQUIREMENTS. ITALY STATED
FINANCES PREVENT THEIR PARTICIPATION UNTIL 1978-1980 AT
THE EARLIEST. GREECE AND TURKEY APPEAR TO WANT THE SAME
SYSTEM COVERAGE PROVIDED THE CENTRAL REGION AT MINIMUM COST
TO THEM. IN BILATERALS, SECDEF MAY WANT TO STRESS IMPORTANCE
NATO AEW REQUIREMENT, THE GREAT VALUE OF US AWACS, AND THE
CRITICAL TIMING OF A NATO AWACS DECISION IN RELATION TO US
AWACS PRODUCTION.

N. MBFR. (APPLICABLE TO ALL.) SECDEF MAY WISH TO
REAFFIRM US SUPPORT FOR ALLIED PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD IN MBFR
NEGOTIATIONS DESIGNED TO LEAD TO A MORE STABLE MILITARY
SITUATION AT LOWER LEVELS OF FORCES WITH UNDIMISISHED

SECURITY AND TO WELCOME THE CONTINUED CLOSE CONSULTATION
AMONG NATO ALLIES ON MBFR. IN PARTICULAR, IT MAY BE USEFUL
FOR SECDEF TO TELL DUTCH MOD THAT THE PLANNED PERSONNEL
REDUCTIONS MAKE AN AS YET UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION ON THE
SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME OF MBFR AND ERODES THE ALLIES
NEGOTIATING POSTURE IN VIENNA. RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO03162
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS 12-31-80
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740687/abbryvkn.tel
Line Count: 278
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: BILATERALS WITH NATO DEFENSE MINISTERS
TAGS: MCAF, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
MADRID
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT

USCINCLANT

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005